2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF12 North China AF12

Their wearers did not belong to the very old group, but were men between 46 and 55 years of age.

A surprisingly small number of persons with physical disabilities were reported in the 515 families.[1] The total was 25. Only three of these were females. There were three blind men and three men and one woman were blind in one eye. Two men were dumb and six were deaf. Lameness was serious enough to be reported for four men and two women. Two men had paralyzed arms and two paralyzed fingers.

With less than one per cent of the group reported as having physical disabilities one cannot but wonder whether the report was incomplete or whether the extra difficulties of life had eliminated others who might have been stricken.

Home Ownership

Home ownership was almost universal for these Ting Hsien families. The figures are 98.8 per cent for the 5,255 families and 96.3 per cent for the 515 families. In a group of families living in Peking only 21.2 per cent owned their homes.[14]

About two-thirds of the non-owners were given the use of their homes, so house rent was paid by only 0.4 per cent of the 5,255 families and by 1.4 per cent of the 515 families. The small proportion of home renters makes it evident that a large proportion of those classed as tenant farmers owned their homes, even though they rented all of the land they farmed. In the 1st District 11.4 per cent of the families were tenant farmers, in the hsien only 4.7 per cent.

The high percentage of home ownership indicates very definitely that Ting Hsien had a steady, settled population and that almost all of the families had been in the area long enough to accumulate the funds needed to buy their homes. Quite a number of the families said that their ancestors came to Ting Hsien about 500 years ago.

In the 71 villages in the 1st District the average family residence area was 2.1 mu, about 100 x 150 feet. In that area the family would have its living quarters, housing for any animals, and storage for all farm equipment and for its food, fodder, and fertilizer.

The total residence area in the 71 villages varied from eight to 800 mu. Sixteen villages had less than 50 mu each. Fourteen had 300 or more mu. The average per family varied from 0.4 mu to 8.2 mu, but

14. Gamble, *op. cit.*

1 [In Ting Hsien -- Analyst]

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF12 North China AF12

128 know that it included more than the average number of the larger and wealthier farms. Because of this difference the families have been divided into groups according to the size of their farms, in order to give a picture of farm activity on different economic levels rather than just for our particular group of families. The farms with not more than 50 mu of land have been divided into five groups, each with a range of 10 mu, and the larger farms into two groups, one with more than 50 but not over 100 mu, the other with over 100 mu. To avoid the constant use of decimals and for ease of designation the group with not more than 10 mu is called the 1–10 mu group, the group with more than 10 mu but not over 20 mu the 11–20 mu group. The families also have been divided into three ownership groups, owners, part-owners, and tenants.

Land Ownership and Area

423 427 Land ownership is always a basic question in any study of farm families. Sixty-one per cent of the 400 families were listed as owners, owning all the land they operated; 33.8 per cent were part-owners, renting part of the land they farmed; 5.2 per cent were tenants who rented all of their land. (See Table 15). The 202 Chai Ch'eng families included in the study were divided 58 per cent owners, 38.5 per cent part-owners, and 3.5 per cent tenants. Our 1931 figures for the entire hsien divided the farming families 70 per cent owners, 25.2 per cent part-owners, and 4.8 per cent tenants. In the six districts of the hsien the proportion of owners ranged from 50.6 to 78 per cent, so it is difficult to find a typical sample.

The total area farmed by the 400 families was 12,377 mu, approximately 3.2 square miles. This was 5.5 per cent of the total farm area of the 62 villages. As a higher proportion of land than families was included in our study, the average size of the 400 farms, 30.9 mu, just over five acres per family, was some 39 per cent larger than the average of all the farms in the Experimental District, 22.2 mu, 3.7 acres per family. It was 46 per cent larger than the hsien average of 21.2 mu, 3.5 acres per farming family. In Chai Ch'eng the average was 26 mu per family.

The averages for our different ownership groups were owners 36.5 mu, part-owners 25.3 mu, and tenants 14.3 mu.

Two and four-tenths per cent of the land was operated by the tenant group and 27.6 per cent by the part-owners. Seventy per cent was farmed by the owner group. The part-owners rented 34 per cent of their farm

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF12 North China AF12

area. Only 11.8 per cent of the total crop area was operated by renters. With 88.2 per cent of owner operation there would be very few of the problems resulting from landlordism and tenancy.

The number of crop mu reported was 15,044. The amount of double cropping therefore was 2,667 mu and the index of double cropping 121. Buck[1] in his land study gave the double cropping index for Hopei province as ranging from 125 to 155. For our three ownership groups there was but little difference in the index. The range was 117 to 124. The lowest was for the tenants, the highest for the part-owners.

We do not have an estimate of the amount of uncultivated and waste land held by the 400 families, nor do we have any figures giving the area of their houses. The latter, of course, were all in the villages and separate from the farm lands. In the 62 villages the cultivated land was 83.3 per cent of the total area; houses 4.7 per cent; roads, graves, and other uncultivated land 12.0 per cent.

A comparison of the averages of the different farm groups shows that many of the differences are directly related to the differences in the size of the farms; the amounts per mu are apt to be quite similar. That being the case, the figures for our 21–30 mu group, with an average farm of 25.6 mu, are probably much more typical for the 62 villages of the Experimental District and for all of Ting Hsien than the averages for the entire 400 families, whose average farm had 30.9 mu. Because of this difference in the averages we have given in the text many more figures for the different sized farm groups than would be the case if we were presenting the 400 farms as a typical and average group.

How the farms were distributed according to size and ownership is shown in Table 16. It will be noted that there were no part-owner or tenant families in the over 100 mu group and no tenant families in the 41–50 mu group. Only three tenant families had more than 20 mu. They operated different sized farms, so the three upper tenant groups had only one family each. Their figures, of course, cannot be taken as typical for those groups. For both the owners and part-owners, the largest group was the 11–20 mu group, 25 and 41.1 per cent respectively. Fifty-two per cent of the tenants were in the 1–10 mu group. Forty-five per cent of all the farms had from one to 20 mu. Their total area was only 18 per cent of the land. The 25 per cent of the families who had over 40 mu had 55 per cent of the land.

1. J. Lossing Buck, *Land Utilization in China* (University of Chicago Press, 1937).

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954AF12 North China AF12

$9.15 for the 1–10 mu tenant group to $129.45 for the 51–100 mu part-owner group. For the over 100 mu owners it was $89.80. 434 241

If the value of the family labor and the cost of the hired labor are added together, the average amount of man labor used was $2.65 per mu. It was $2.20 for the tenants, $3.10 for the part-owners, and $2.65 for the owners. For both the 1–10 mu and over 100 mu owner groups the amount was $2.30 per mu. The highest owner amount was $3.00, the average for the 21–30 mu and the 31–40 mu group.

The reported value of the animal labor averaged $41.50 per farm. For the tenants the amount was $15.05. For the part-owners it was $36.15, more than double the tenant average, while for the owners the average was $46.75, just over three times the tenant figure. The per mu averages were much closer. They were tenants $1.05, part-owners $1.45, and owners $1.30.

Land rent averaged $53.60 per farm for the tenants and $31.55 for the part-owners. The average per mu was $3.65. For the different sized tenant farms the average rent per mu varied from $3.20 for the 1–10 mu group to $4.90 for the 31–40 mu group. It must be remembered that there was only one family in the latter group. The other single family tenant groups reported rents of $3.50 and $4.50 per mu. The village land owned by Chai Ch'eng was rented at $3.00 per mu. The records seem to show that the rented land was all let on a cash rather than a share basis. 427 434

Fertilizer cost the owners $11.15, the part-owners $5.60, and the tenants $2.50 per year. The owners spent almost twice as much per mu as the tenants, but even for the owners the average was only 31 cents per mu. The largest farm generally paid the most per mu, but the amount did not increase regularly as the size of the farm increased. The value of the fertilizer produced on the farm or collected by the boys was not included in these figures. 434 241

The cost of seed was the largest for the owners, $3.40, and the least for the tenants, $2.75. However, the tenants' cost per mu, 20 cents, was just twice that of the owners. The tenants apparently spent on seed the amount they saved on fertilizer, when compared with the owners.

Fodder was a very small item as most of the food for the animals came direct from the farm. The average expenditure for both owners and part-owners was $1.70. The tenant average was $2.65, owing to the expenditure of $16 and $20 by two families. From the per mu figures,

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF12 North China AF12

511 income groups. The same was true of the income per person figures. Generally the amounts were about $4.00 per month per person and $5.00 per month per adult male equivalent. The lowest amounts were in the $100–$200 group, the highest in the $300–$400 group rather than in the $400–$500 group. The $300–$400 group average per adult male equivalent was only 11 per cent above that of the $100–$200 group.

434 The sources of the family income, shown in Table 37, include three sources of farm income: crops, land rent, and other farm income. Crop
511 income is the net income after paying the necessary operating expenses. It includes the cash income from any crops sold and the value of the crops used by the families. It averaged generally between $6.50 and $7.00 per mu. Only three families reported crop income of more than $10.00 per mu. Five families reported less than $5.00 per mu.

The averages were somewhat higher than those given by dividing the average crop income by the average number of mu per family, as eight of the families rented to others part of their land holdings. The total amount received from this source was $139.45. The records do not give the exact number of mu rented, but an average rate of $3.50 per mu would make it 40 mu. That amount has been deducted in figuring the crop income per mu.

Other farm income included the value of animals and animal products sold or used on the farm, also the value of wood from the farm trees. Four-fifths of the families received some income from this source, the amounts ranging from $6.00 to $185.00. The latter, undoubtedly, was the family that sold a horse. The next largest amounts reported were $71 and $68. All of the 27 families reporting income from animals either sold or used some pork. The majority listed eggs, nine wood. Three sold mules. The sale of the mules and the horse may have represented the sale of a capital item rather than current income, but, lacking definite information, we have counted the amount received as part of the family income.

"Miscellaneous income" included wages earned, business profit, and other occasional items. Twenty-four families reported amounts varying from 70 cents to $150. For four families, the amount was over $75. They all received $130 or more. Three of the four families were in the $400–$500 income group.

511 House rent was purely a bookkeeping item, entered on both the in-
427 come and expense side of the family accounts, as all of the families

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF12 North China AF12

owned their homes and paid no rent. The figures used, therefore, were the estimated rent value of the house occupied by the family. To make our figures comparable with those in other budget studies, it has been necessary to include a rent charge in the family expenses and balance it with a like amount on the income side. It averaged 5.1 per cent of the total estimated value of the houses, $12,300. The estimated value of the individual houses ranged from $120 to $920, but only four were worth more than $500. The average value was $360. The values used for the different kinds of construction were $40 per chien for a house with earthen walls and no porch, $70 per chien if the house had a porch. If the walls were brick the value was $60 per chien without and $90 with a porch.

The estimated rents of the four types of houses were 15, 20, 30, and 35 cents per chien per month, or from $1.80 to $4.20 per chien per year. The rent value of the brick walled, no porch house was higher than that of the earthen walled house with porch even though the value of the latter house was estimated to be $10 more than that of the brick walled house. The amount of housing and the relation of the rent item to the family budget is given in connection with the rent expenditure.

Ten families reported spending more money than they received. The totals for the different income groups have been averaged for the group. Two of the lowest income families had deficits of some $76. All of the families with incomes of less than $170 per year reported borrowing from $20 to $50. Two families in the $300–$400 group reported borrowing to meet deficits. Amounts borrowed were not counted as income except for the amount necessary to cover the reported deficit. Lacking inventories of the families' food supply at the beginning and end of our study, we cannot determine how much of the deficits was covered from that source and how much from other sources not noted in the family accounts.

How the family expenditure was divided by amount and per cent among the six main expense headings of food, clothing, fuel, rent, miscellaneous, and surplus is shown in Figure 16 and Table 38. It will be noted that the amounts for clothing, rent, fuel, and miscellaneous are all small, about $1.00 a month for the low income families, increasing to about $2.00 a month for the highest income group. The expenditure for food increased from some $9.00 a month for families in the $100–$200 group to $20 a month for those in the $400–$500 group. The pro-

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

435 proportion was 25.2 per cent, but it was only 8 per cent in the 4th District.

In 238 villages controlling 839,540 mu of land, of which 55.4 per cent was irrigated, 21.9 per cent of the unirrigated land was worth less than $25 and 66.2 per cent less than $50 per mu. Only 0.6 per cent was worth $100 or more. For the irrigated land the figures were practically reversed. Only 0.2 per cent was reported as worth less than $25 per mu, while 20.9 per cent was worth $100 or more. For the irrigated land the median value was between $75 and $99 per mu. For the unirrigated land it was between $25 and $49 per mu. (See Table 62.)

427 423 Only 3,826 families, 5.9 per cent of the land owning families, rented land to others. All but 514 of this number were owner-lessors and farmed part of the land they owned. The 514 non-farming landlords, who rented all the land they owned, were only 0.7 per cent of the Ting Hsien families. One-third of the non-farming landlords lived in the city and another one-sixth in the 1st District. Of the families living in the city, 7.8 per cent were listed as landlords. In the 1st District the figure was 1.5 per cent. In the other districts the non-farming landlords were not more than 0.7 per cent of the families. In the 4th District the figure was only 0.1 per cent.

The land rented to others by the owner-lessors and the landlords totaled 173,890 mu, 12.2 per cent of the privately owned crop area. (See Table 63.) Crop area, rather than farm area, figures are used as they do not include waste land, land used for houses, graves, and roads and so give a better basis for farming figures.

There was much more renting in the city and the 1st District around it than in the other districts. In this connection it must be remembered that 28,210 mu of land in the city and the three suburbs were classed as farm land and included in the crop area. In the 1st District and the city together 23.9 per cent of the crop area was rented, in the 2nd District 16.3 per cent, but in the 3rd District only 6.9 per cent. For the other districts the rental figures were all slightly more than 10 per cent.

Full tenants, those who rented all the land they farmed, numbered only 3,253. They were 4.7 per cent of all the families in the hsien and 4.8 per cent of the farm-operating families. The part-owners, who owned part and rented part of the land they farmed, were 24.2 per cent of all the families and 25.2 per cent of the farming families. If the part-owners are included in the tenant group the tenancy figure was 30

2· Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

per cent of the farm operators, but then more than five out of six of the tenant group owned part of the land they farmed. If, on the other hand, the part-owners are included in the owning group the owner-farmers were 91.4 per cent of all the families and 95.1 per cent of the farming families. Tenancy could hardly be called a serious problem in Ting Hsien.

Renting part of a family's land holding was usually a matter of renting one or more separate fields. In a study of the land holdings of 1,136 families in four villages we found that the number of fields per family varied from one to 29; that 70 per cent of the families owned more than one field; that the total number of fields was 3,798; that the average was 3.3 fields per family. In one village the average was 5.2 fields per family. In another it was 2.9 fields. The highest average was in the smallest village of 103 families. The lowest average was in the largest village with 586 families. Just over two-thirds of the families, 67.4 per cent, had from one to three fields. Only 3.0 per cent had more than 10 fields.

In size the individual fields ranged from less than one mu to 78 mu. Twenty-five per cent were less than two mu, 70 per cent were under five mu, and 78.5 per cent were less than six mu, one acre. Only 8.8 per cent of the fields contained 10 or more mu while only 14 fields, 0.4 per cent, were as large as 30 mu, five acres. The average was just under five mu.

In the four villages 40 per cent of the fields were less than one li, one-third of a mile, from the owner's home in the village, while 87 per cent were within three li, one mile. In one village, however, almost one-quarter of the fields were reported to be more than one mile from the village. In two villages families reported that they had fields as much as two miles from their house. (See Table 64.)

The average family holding in the four villages was some 16 mu or six mu less than the hsien average. If allowance is made for this difference the average number of plots per land owning family in the hsien was probably at least four and possibly even slightly more.

The government's estimate of the average number of fields per family is shown by the minimum number of deeds the villages were required to submit in connection with the deed inspection program announced in August, 1927. At least 500 deeds were to be presented by villages with from 50 to 200 families, 1,500 by the 200 to 500 family villages, and 3,000 by those with from 500 to 1,000 families. With the minimum re-

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF12

427 423 quirement three deeds per family and the maximum 10, the normal expectation evidently was between four and five deeds per family.

241 The division of the family land holdings, the relatively small size of the plots, the distances from the village, all would make for difficult farming, consume extra time in going to and from the fields, and require extra transportation of tools. At harvest time it would greatly complicate the supervision and protection of the crops and may very well have been one of the reasons for the Green Crop Society or the Agricultural Association taking over the general watching of the crops.

423 427 Only 271 families, 1.3 per cent of the 20,185 families who rented farm land, paid their rent by giving the landlord a share of the crop produced on the land. It had been our expectation that this would be a much higher figure. For over half the renters, 54.0 per cent, the rent was fixed in dollars. For 40.4 per cent it was stated in quantities of millet, cotton, wheat, or kaoliang per mu but usually it was paid in money, the amount being determined by the market value of the crop-rent at the time of payment. (See Table 65.) Millet was the most generally used unit for the cash-crop rent. It was reported by 7,947 families. Cotton was the unit for only 212 families. Wheat and kaoliang were used by only a few families.

Sample rent studies showed amounts ranging from 50 cents to $7.50 per mu and returns to the landlord of from 3.0 to 8.9 per cent of the value of the land. The average return apparently was not more than 6.0 per cent. There was considerable variation in the return on land of different value in a given area and on land of the same value in different parts of the hsien. Generally the middle value land appeared to be in greater demand than either the cheaper or the more expensive land and therefore to command a somewhat higher return.

Estimated rents in the 1st District were generally between 3.0 and 3.5 per cent of the value of the unirrigated land and from 4.0 to 4.6 per cent of the value of the irrigated land.

The rates were higher in two sample villages, one in the north part of the hsien, the other in the south. For the north village the average return was 5.9 per cent. For the south village it was 20 per cent higher, 7.1 per cent. (See Table 66.)

In six villages in the Experimental District the cash rent averaged 5.9, 6.3, and 5.2 per cent for the first, second, and third grades of land.

In our study of 400 farm families the average rent figure was $1.69 per mu for land worth less than $40 per mu, $3.63 for the middle grade of

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF 12 North China AF12

land worth from $40 to $79 per mu, and $4.20 for the land worth $80 or more per mu. The amounts were 6.2, 6.0, and 4.8 per cent of the average values of the three grades of land. For all the families the average was 5.25 per cent. (See Chapter III.)

Considering the high interest rates paid on loans we have been interested to find these relatively low returns on land values. Evidently the fact that land was the chief medium for investment in the rural areas had so increased the price that the rent produced only a relatively small yield on the land value.

The cash-crop rent paid in cotton was 35, 20, and 8 catties per mu for the first, second, and third grade land in one village of our six village group. In another village the rates were 40, 24.5, and 10 catties per mu. The millet rates were the same in both villages, 7.0 and 1.5 tou for first and third grade land. In two sample villages one tou of wheat was accepted as the equivalent of two tou of millet although at 1928 prices one tou of wheat was equal to 1.8 tou of millet and at 1931 prices to 1.6 tou.

In some villages, where the land was double cropped, from one-half to two-thirds of the rent was paid after the spring harvest.

In the six villages the cash rent, in 1928, was regularly higher than the cash-crop rent for the first and second grades of land, with values from $40 to $120 per mu, but it was lower for the third class land worth from $10 to $40 per mu. The more than 30 per cent drop in grain prices from 1928 to 1931 would greatly augment the difference for the higher priced lands and about equalize the rents for the third class land, if there was no change in the cash rents. However, it seems probable that the cash rents also went down unless the land was rented for more than one year.

Cotton rents were higher than grain rents in 1928 and the difference apparently was even larger in 1931 as the price of cotton went down some 11 per cent in three years while grain prices dropped more than 30 per cent.

The figures of our sample rent studies indicate that the cash and the cash-crop rent charge averaged between 35 and 40 per cent of the average gross income from the land. Share rent was regularly 50 per cent of the crop.

In one village the majority of the renters had their land on a year by year basis. In another village the landlords required a written rental

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

contract, usually for a three year term. They also required an advance rent of $1.00 per mu. This was refunded at the end of the term, but was kept by the landlord in case the tenant gave up the land before the end of the rental contract. Another report said that the share rent contracts were generally on a one year basis, the cash-crop more often on a three year basis, while the cash contracts were often for five years.

One village rented its school land for a term of five years. The rent was paid in money, the amount being fixed by bidding at a town meeting when the previous renting contract expired. The successful bidder was required to have his contract guaranteed by one of his friends. Another village reported that the rent on its school land was set at $3.00 per mu per year.

There were 2,739 more farm-operating families than there were farm-owning families. The addition of 3,253 full tenant families and the subtraction of the 514 non-farming landlord families accounted for the difference. The crop area farmed by the operating families, 1,424,930 mu, was larger by some 8,070 mu than that held by the farm-owning families. The difference was the result of renting, to private operators, the lands owned by schools, temples, villages, or other public organizations. The average farm, per operating family, was 21.2 mu, only slightly less than the 21.9 mu average of the land-owning families. For an average family of 5.8 persons the average amount of land per person was 3.7 mu, about 0.6 of an acre.

The proportions of the operating families farming 50 or more mu and less than 25 mu were both less than the figures for the land owning families holding those amounts. The large land owners and the landlords reduced their holdings by renting, the tenants and the small land owners increased theirs. One hundred and thirty-two families owned 300 or more mu but only 15 families were farming that much land. The 840 families farming from 100 to 299 mu were almost one-third less than the families owning that much land. At least 141 and possibly considerably more of the 4,460 families owning from 50 to 99 mu rented out some of their land. After the land holding went above 60 mu, 10 acres, it apparently became more and more advantageous to rent part of the land rather than farm it with family or hired labor. The tenant shared the risk of the farm operation.

Detailed reports were secured on the area devoted to some 37 different crops. The list included nine grains, four legumes, six vegetables, three

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF 12 N rth China AF 12

423
427

TABLE 59. LARGEST FARM HOLDING, 453 VILLAGES[1]

Mu	*Villages*	*Per Cent*	*Mu*	*Villages*	*Per Cent*
Under 50	7	1.6	300–349	31	6.8
50–99	81	17.9	350–399	22	4.9
100–149	126	27.8	400–499	16	3.5
150–199	83	18.3	500–999	14	3.1
200–249	42	9.3	1,000–1,499	1[2]	0.2
250–299	29	6.4	1,500 and over	1[3]	0.2
				453	100.0

[1] Largest holding in city, 3,950 mu. [2] 1,150. [3] 1,800.

TABLE 60. SIZE OF FARMS PRIVATELY OWNED

Area	*Number*	*Per Cent*	*Mu*	*Per Cent*	*Average*
Under 25 mu	46,447	72.0	468,940	33.1	10.1
25–49	12,288	19.0	401,230	28.3	32.7
50–99	4,460	6.9	304,830	21.5	68.1
100–299	1,223	1.9	180,280	12.7	147.0
300 and over	132	0.2	61,580	4.4	466.0
Total or average	64,550	100.0	1,416,860	100.0	22.0

TABLE 61. VALUE OF FARM LAND

471
423

Value per Mu	*Total Mu*	*Per Cent*
Under $25	149,160	10.5
25–49	344,320	24.3
50–74	399,340	28.2
75–99	307,190	21.7
100–124	169,010	11.9
125–149	39,580	2.8
150 and over	8,260	0.6
	1,416,860[1]	100.0

[1] Publicly owned land omitted.

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

435 TABLE 62. VALUE OF IRRIGATED AND UNIRRIGATED LAND, 238 VILLAGES

	Irrigated		*Unirrigated*	
Value per Mu	*Mu*	*Per Cent*	*Mu*	*Per Cent*
Under $25	1,080	0.2	81,910	21.9
25–49	65,040	14.0	166,000	44.3
50–74	152,600	32.8	102,060	27.3
75–99	149,030	32.1	21,950	5.9
100–124	77,840	16.7	2,210	0.6
125–149	16,900	3.6	–	–
150 and over	2,930	0.6	–	–
	465,420	100.0	374,130	100.0

Per cent irrigated, 55.5.

427 TABLE 63. LAND TENURE, 453 VILLAGES AND CITY

	Families	*Per Cent*
Owner	43,792	62.5
Owner lessor	3,312	4.7
Part-owner	16,932	24.2
Tenant	3,253	4.7
Landlord	514	0.7
Hired laborer	870	1.2
No farm	1,361	2.0
	70,034	100.0
	Number	*Per Cent*
Owners	64,550	92.1
Non-owners	5,484	7.9
	70,034	100.0
Operators	67,289	96.1
Non-operators	2,745	3.9
	70,034	100.0
	Mu	*Per Cent*
Land operated by owners	1,251,040	87.8
Land operated by renters	173,890	12.2

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933)1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

241

TABLE 64. FARM FIELDS IN FOUR VILLAGES

Fields per Family

Fields	*Families*	*Per Cent*	*Fields*	*Families*	*Per Cent*
1	337	29.6	9	11	1.0
2	269	23.6	10	10	0.9
3	162	14.2	11–15	25	2.0
4	108	9.5	16–20	8	0.7
5	72	6.3	Over 20	3	0.3
6	69	6.1	No data	3	0.3
7	34	3.0	Total	1,139	100.0
8	28	2.5			

Size of Fields

Size	*Number*	*Per Cent*	*Size*	*Number*	*Per Cent*
Under 1 mu	241	6.4	8–8.9	112	3.0
1–1.9	734	19.3	9–9.9	62	1.6
2–2.9	707	18.5	10–14.9	220	5.8
3–3.9	574	15.1	15–24.9	88	2.3
4–4.9	413	10.9	25–49.9	23	0.6
5–5.9	311	8.2	50 and over	3	0.1
6–6.9	176	4.6	No data	35	0.9
7–7.9	99	2.6	Total	3,798	100.0

Distance of Fields from Family Residence

Distance	*Fields*	*Per Cent*	*Distance*	*Fields*	*Per Cent*
Under 0.5 li	618	16.3	4.0–4.9	117	3.1
0.5–0.9	879	23.1	5.0–5.9	66	1.7
1.0–1.9	1,272	33.5	6 and over	6	0.2
2.0–2.9	528	13.9	Total	3,798	100.0
3.0–3.9	312	8.2			

TABLE 65. RENTING SYSTEM, 453 VILLAGES

427

	Part-owners	*Tenants*	*Total*	*Per Cent*
Cash	9,360	1,536	10,896	54.0
Cash crop millet	6,614	1,333	7,947	39.4
Cash crop cotton	188	24	212	1.0
Share	231	40	271	1.3
No data	539	320	859	4.3
	16,932	3,253	20,185	100.0

2: Gamble S-5 (1926-1933) 1954 AF 12 North China AF 12

427 TABLE 66. PROPORTION OF LAND VALUE PAID AS RENT, TWO VILLAGES

	Village No. 1		Village No. 2	
Land Value	*Average Rent*	*Per Cent of Value*	*Average Rent*	*Per Cent of Value*
Under $25	$1.10	5.5	$1.15	5.9
25–49	2.40	6.0	2.85	8.[illegible]
50–74	3.80	6.3	4.85	8.3
75–99	5.40	6.4	5.35	6.4
100–149	6.00	5.3	6.80	6.5
150 and over	7.50	5.0	–	–
Average	5.25	5.9	4.50	7.1

434 TABLE 67. CASH AND CROP RENT, SIX VILLAGES, 1928

	Cash Rent		Average Rent	
Land Values	*Rent*	*Per Cent*	*Cash*	*Kind*
First class, $75–$120	$5.50–$7.00	5.0–7.3	$5.60	$4.90
Second class, $40–$80	$2.00–$4.00	5.0–7.8	$3.30	$2.60
Third class, $10–$40	$0.50–$1.00	5.0–6.0	$0.70	$1.20

Crop Rent, Amounts

	Cotton	*Millet*	*Wheat*	*Kaoliang*
First class	35–40 catties	5.5–7.0 tou	3.5 tou	–
Second class	20–25 "	2.0–4.0 "	1.4–2.0 "	4.0 tou
Third class	8–10 "	1.5 "	0.6–1.0 "	2.0 "

Crop Prices

	Cotton	*Millet*	*Wheat*	*Kaoliang*
1928	$0.145	$0.72	$1.30	$0.83
1931	0.128	0.50	0.88	0.543

TABLE 68. SIZE OF FARMS OPERATED

241

Area	*Number*	*Per Cent*	*Mu*	*Per Cent*	*Average*
Under 25 mu	47,105	70.1	539,310	37.9	11.4
25–49	15,010	22.3	482,950	33.9	32.2
50–99	4,319	6.4	286,960	20.1	66.5
100–299	840	1.2	109,760	7.7	130.7
300 and over	15	–	5,950	0.4	396.6
	67,289	100.0	1,424,930[1]	100.0	21.2

[1] Includes 8,070 mu of publicly owned land.

3:Chao E-5 (1939-1941)1948 AF12 North China AF12

their former condition. The monetary inflation was accelerated in the last years of the war. Those who had little reserve were very hard hit. Some of the clever rich had profited. The short period of price-falling, immediately after the war, had a bad effect on those who had full confidence in the government, when the inflation came back again even at a more rapid rate of acceleration.

Members of the richest family were not in the village. They looked for and lived in cities, as places of security and merriment. Their house and farm were in the hands of two old laborers. These two old laborers of the house became managers of the farm and hired other laborers for the work. The relation of the two laborers to members of the house was one not merely economic in nature, but something personal. The rent of the land was not fixed but varied from year to year at the good will of the managing-laborers. The house was very much dilapidated which was a sign of negligence on the fact of the managing-laborers, and the scant attention paid by the proprietors to their property. The relation of the two groups of laborers was interesting. The manager-laborers had not sufficient time to assume the attitude of a managing-farmer. They commanded the respect of the hired laborers, not so much by their authority, but rather because of their skill in farming.

The major effect of the end of the war was the change in the formal political machinery, and the consequential shift in its personnel. The *pao-chia* system was there when we first revisited the village, but the *fang-li* system and the *Hsin Min Hui* were no longer in existence. The school principal became the deputy head of the *lien-pao* together with new heads of the six old *chia*. Beneath this superficial structure was the struggle for power between two groups. An ambitious duet of father and son wanted to control the *lien-pao*. They organized a group of self-protection militia with the explicit purpose of strengthening the protection of life and property in the local district. They utilized external influence to oust the head, and the deputy head, of the *lien-pao* by accusing them as collaborators of the enemy.

Amidst this struggle for power came a mishap to the deputy head, and his removal from the position of school principal. Whether his removal had anything to do with the political struggle was not known, but following this removal he resigned his office of deputy head. The whole episode was certainly a blow to Mr. H. As we may recall, Mr. H. had the ambition to restore the status

4: Burgess E-4,5 (1926-1927) 1928 AF12 North China AF12

CHAPTER VIII

GUILD FINANCES

A. Sources of Guild Income

Membership fees, paid either by individuals or by stores, are the principal source of income of the guilds studied in Peking. Additional income is derived from property or investments, fines and assessments. Table X[1] shows that thirty-eight of the forty-two guilds report income from regular dues. Ten guilds report receiving money either from rent or from land, or from invested funds. Guilds that receive rent either from the temples they own or from their guild headquarters, are the Carpenters, Leather Box Makers, Shoe Fasteners, Barbers, Restaurants, Silk and Satin Stores, Shoe Stores, and Porters. The Tailors possess 70 mu or 23 acres of land which they rent for a burial ground, while the Fur Stores receive ten per cent interest on the investment of a thousand taels which yields them 100 taels ($138.89) a year.

Our data regarding which guilds receive money from fines are extremely meager. The guildsmen simply reported the total yearly income of their organizations without specifying the sources from which the income was derived. In most guilds fines are, however, a minor factor in the total income.

[1] *Cf.* pp. 148-149.

5: Tao E-5 (1926-1927) 1928 AF12 North China AF12

In view of the limited space in the room, any one, not acquainted with the living conditions of the families studied, would be curious to know how they could possibly work and live there. The *kang* is not only a bed to sleep on, but serves also as a sitting place or a working table as occasion requires. In the summer time, the inmates of the house might work or even sleep in the courtyard, while in the winter time they certainly find no discomfort to huddle together, in order to get warmth. Even cooking does not present any difficulty to them, for the small stove can be installed in the room, if it is winter time, both for cooking food and generating heat, while in the summer, the simple cooking operations can be done in the courtyard. And it is fortunate for the Peking people, at least in this respect, that there are comparatively few rainy days throughout the warm seasons.

Table 17.—Average Number of Equivalent Adults Per Room and Average Amount Paid for Rent in 6 Months, by Income Groups.

Income group	Number of families	Average number of persons living in home per family		Average number of rooms per family	Average number of persons per room		Average rent in 6 months		
		Persons	equivalent Adults		Persons	equivalent Adults	Per family	Per person living in home	Per equivalent adult living in home
Under $ 70	3	3 67	2.60	1.00	3.67	2.60	$8.00	$2.18	$3.08
$ 70 and under $110...	28	4.04	2.86	1.00	4.04	2.86	7.59	1.88	2.65
$110 and under $150...	14	4.93	3.70	1.14 §	4.31	3.23	7.81	1.59	2.11
$150 and under $190...	3	5.00	3.90	1.00	5.00	3.90	6.80	1.36	1.74
All incomes	48	4.33	3.16	1.04	4.16	3.04	7.63	1.76	2.43

§ Of this group, two families occupied two rooms each.

Such being the general conditions of the room in Peking, we shall now proceed to study the housing conditions of our forty-eight families. To have separate rooms for work, sleep and receiving guests is only an extravagance of the well-to-do, while the working class people have to content themselves with one

5: Tao E-5 (1926-1927) 1928 AF12 North China AF12

362
427

room for a variety of purposes. And even that, it is a piece of luck to have. Thus, it will be seen from Table 17 that of all the families investigated, but two were living in one room. There were on the average 3.04 equivalent adults living and sleeping in one room. It is, however, noteworthy that families of smaller incomes appeared to have fewer persons in a room, while in the family of the highest income group, 3.9 equivalent adults should have all slept in one room. The general tendency seems to suggest that the increase of the average number of equivalent adults living in one room corresponds with the rise of income. In other words, the higher the income of the family, the more persons in it live together in one room.

In seeking an explanation of this rather peculiar phenomenon, one has only to study the average amount of rentals paid by our families. The average rental per family of the four income groups ranged itself between $6.80 and $8.00 for six months. But the remarkable thing is that the amount of the rental paid and the income of the family do not correspond with each other. Although the families of higher incomes have more members sleeping in the home, yet they seemed to prefer overcrowding themselves in one room to renting an extra one by spending a little more money. There is no doubt that families of higher income groups suffer from overcrowding, although their comparatively higher economic standing enabled them to spend more on food. This confirms our contention in an earlier chapter[1] that the higher incomes received by some of our families were not due so much to the rise in the rate of their wages as to the greater number of their family members earning money to contribute to the family chest.

The housing conditions of our families can hardly be called satisfactory. Whether judged by the English official standard which allows one person to a room or by the stricter standard employed by Dr. Bowley in "Livelihood and Poverty"[2] which considers more than one equivalent adult to a room as overcrowding, all our families were no doubt too far overcrowded. For

[1] See Chap. V. pp. 67-70.
[2] A. L. Bowley and A. R. Burnett-Hurst, *Livelihood and Proverty* London 1915.

5: Tao E-5 (1926-1927) 1928 AF12 North China AF12

there were on the average 3.04 equivalent adults to a room. While it would require a separate housing survey before we are able to say definitely whether the families of the class studied all live in overcrowded rooms or not, yet so far as the small amount of evidence disclosed by our present inquiry as well as our personal knowledge of the poor class of families in Peking furnish us any ground for generalization, we feel we can state that for a family of three adults with an income of less than 30 dollars per month, to have one adult to a room is an impossibility. It may be added that housing in Peking by no means represents the worst type in this country and this is to be found in the big cities, like Shanghai, Tientsin etc., where congestion of the worst possible kind obtains. If rapid development of industry and commerce in the cities forces up the cost of land and buildings and consequently house rentals on the one hand and there lacks an enlightened municipal authority to plan the housing of workers or to devise easy transportation facilities for them on the other, overcrowding and slum life are bound to happen. And there is no doubt that overcrowding can never be obliterated in Peking, unless measures are taken by the municipal authorities' to cope with the changing conditions of the city.

HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

To complete the description of the housing conditions of our families, it is worthwhile to study the contents of the room and to make an enumeration of the articles owned by them. When the budget study of the working families was concluded in March, 1927, inventories of all the articles in their possession were taken and estimates were then made of the original and the present cost of each article. Evidently it cannot be urged that the inventories are all exhaustive, for allowances must be made for some articles that escaped the notice of either the informant or the investigator and consequently failed to appear on the lists, nor are the estimates entirely faultless. Nevertheless, they may be considered on the whole accurate and fairly representative of the class of families under investigation.

STORES

In view of the inequality of capital stock we find 443
the average figure of $1,070 worthless as an indication of typical capital for all stores. If we divide the stores into two types large and small, taking $1,000 as the dividing line, we find the two averages of $3,224.3 for the larger stores, and only $132.3 for the small stores.

In the collection of data concerning capital stock we had great difficulty in obtaining accurage figures, as some of the stores refused to answer our questions, and therefore, certain figures are estimates made by observation of the business, and from conversations with the owners; but although the reader is warned against using the figures given as accurate data, yet the general information which they convey is useful for our guidance and further study.

7. Ownership and Value of Store Premises.

From the following table we can see that 77% of 443
the stores are rented, and only 21.3% owned by the 472
occupiers, and in two cases the stores are half owned 427
and half rented.

TABLE XXVIII. OWNERSHIP OF STORE PREMISES.

OWNERSHIP	No.	%
Owner operator	26	21.3
Rented	94	77.0
Half owned	2	1.7
Total	122	100.0

CHING HC: A SOCIALOGICAL ANALYSIS

443 472 427 There is a wide range in the value of stores from the hut worth a few dollars to the well-built store of $15,000, although the value of the majority is between $100 abd $2,000. Table XXIX gives the values and shows that 91 stores or 74.6% have premises valued between $200 and $1,999. The average value of all premises is difficult to calculate, and values are given

TABLE XXIX VALUE OF STORE PREMISES.

VALUE CLASSES. MEX. $.	NO. OF STORES.	TOTAL VALUE.
0-9	1	5
10-49	3	76
50-99	7	525
100-199	21	2,625
200-299	17	3,825
300-399	11	3,575
400-499	12	4,900
500-999	16	10,000
1000-1999	14	17,500
2000-2999	4	9,000
3000-3999	5	17,500
5000 and over	3	36,000
Total	114	105,530
Unknown	8	

6:Young et. al. E-5 (1928-1929) 1930 AF12 North China AF12

in round numbers in most cases, and with the exception of the first three classes, and the last, the first quartile is used in the calculation to represent the whole class. The last average is the approximate average between the three figures 10,000, 10,000 and 15,000. From the assumptions stated above we can get the average value of all premises in Ching Ho which must of course, have a very large probable error. The average is calculated to be $925.7.

427
443
472

8. Organisation and Management.

91.8% are run under the simple style of a single owner proprietorship; two stores are under the joint control of brothers; and only eight stores, or 6.9% are carried on by partners. Not a single store is organised under the modern method of incorporation, and the lack of this from may be due to the small amount of capital required in the businesses, which can easily be raised by the proprietor himself or with the help of one or two partners.

472
443

TABLE XXX. ORGANISATION OF STORES.

TYPES OF ORGANISATION.	STORES	
	NO.	%
Proprietorship	112	91.8
Borthers	2	1.6
Parnership	8	6.6
2 partners	5	
3 „	2	
5 „	1	
Total	122	100.0

ECONOMY

Although we could not obtain the value of the 427 ●
rented houses, it was possible to find the amount of rent paid by the tenants, most of whom are paying a rent of less than $1.00 for the month. The average rent paid is 72 cents for the month or $8.64 for the year.

TABLE XXXIII. DISTRIBUTION OF RENT

AMOUNT (¢)	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
No rent	13	7.5
Under 10	1	0.6
10 - 19	22	12.7
20 - 29	46	26.6
30 - 39	13	7.5
40 - 49	9	5.2
50 - 59	17	9.8
60 - 99	13	7.5
$1.00 - $1.49	18	10.4
$1.50 - $1.99	5	2.9
$2.00 -	16	9.3
Total	173	100.0
Unknown	1	

Turning our attention from the financial aspect 362
of the housing problem to the physical aspect we find that the average number of rooms per family is 3.94.

CHING HO: A SOCIALOGICAL ANALYSIS

TABLE XXXVI. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND VALUE

423

VALUE (DOLLBRS)	NO. OF OASES	NO. OF CASES
Under 100	7	7.1
100 - 199	16	16.3
200 - 299	8	8.2
300 - 339	13	13.3
400 - 499	15	15.3
500 - 479	10	10.2
750 - 999	9	9.2
1,000 - 1,999	15	15.3
2,000 - 2,999	2	2.0
3,000 -	3	3.1
Total	98	100.0
Unknown	8	

425
427

Only 24 families rent land from others snd six families both own their own land and at the same time rent land from others. This percentage is relatively low in comparison with other distribts of China and in comparison with the housing situation.

TABLE XXXVII. OWNERSHIP OF LAND

OWNERSHIP	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Owned	116	79.5
Rented	24	16.4
Half owned	6	4.1
Total	146	100.0

ECONOMY

The acreage of the rented land is much smaller than the acreage of owned land, the average size of land rented by the 24 families being only 9.6 mow as compared with 29 mow of owned land. Most of the families rented only a few mow of land.

TABLE XXXVIII. ACREAGE OF RENTED LAND.

AREA-MOW	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Under 5	6	25.0
5 - 9	13	54.2
10 - 19	2	8.3
20 - 29	2	8.3
30 - 49	1	4.2
Total	24	100.0

If we combine together the land held under these there types of ownership we shall get the land area of each farmstead or holding. The average size of farmstead or holding is 26 mow with most of the distribution in the first four classes.

TABLE XXXIX. SIZE OF HOLDINGS

SIZE (MOWS)	NO. OF CASES	PERCENTAGE
Under 5	19	15.6
5 - 9	30	24.6
10 - 14	15	12.3
15 - 19	15	12.3
20 - 29	10	8.2
30 - 49	16	13.1
50 - 99	13	10.7
100 - 199	4	3.3
Total	122	100.0
Unknown	8	

7: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AF12 North China AF12

427 *Rent Value* is the amount the families occupying property rent-free have estimated they would have to pay, if they rented the property. Because the omission of rent from a considerable proportion of the accounts would greatly change the figures for the different income groups, it has seemed best to add this rent value to both the income and expense sides of the accounts in cases where families owned their homes, were allowed to live in houses rent-free, or made enough by subletting rooms at an advanced rent to give them their own quarters partly, or entirely, rent-free.

434 *Surplus* is the amount added to the expense side to balance the account when the reported expenditure for both current and capital items was less than the current income. In some instances, this surplus possibly represents some unreported expenditure. The rest would be unexpended savings.

Wages is the amount received from all forms of personal activity. It includes wages, salary, commissions, profit from business such as peddling, story-telling, fortune-telling, making and selling hair ornaments, paper flowers, medicine, pens.

7: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AF12 North China AF12

423 There were 19 families who paid no rent during the 465 entire year, but did not own the houses in which they lived. Two lived in houses given them free by their relatives. Seventeen were given their houses by their employers as part of their salaries or wages. They were watchmen, gate-keepers, workers in stores or factories, school-teachers, preachers and others engaged in religious work.

Twenty families paid no rent during part of the year; to seven of these, houses were given for part of the time by their employers; to seven others, houses were loaned by relatives or friends, for one or more months; six families lived part of the year in houses that they owned, and part of the year in rented property.

423 Fourteen families reported that they rented larger 427 houses than they needed for their own use, and then endeavored to sublet the extra rooms. If all the extra rooms could be rented, there was apparently a profit of 75 cents to $1 per room per month. Three families made enough in this way to give them their own rooms rent-free; three others, enough to pay part of the rent for the rooms they used. The other eight families were unable to get enough to pay the rent of the extra rooms. One family, who had been using three rooms and paying $5.50 a month rent, in May took over the other five rooms in the house and paid a total rent of $17 a month. Their venture was a complete loss, as they were unable to sublet any of the rooms. Finally in October they moved to a six-room house, for which they paid $12 a month. Another family paid $30 a month for a twelve-room house. They planned to use eight rooms and sublet four. The four rooms were rented for three months, but from April

: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AP12 North China AP12

423 to September the family was unable to find any tenants.
427 Beginning in September, three rooms were rented for $7 a month. The total receipts for the year were only $43, or less than the cost of two rooms.

427 One hundred and ninety-three families—68 per cent of the group—paid rent for their houses during the entire year.

361 Fifty-five families moved from one house to another during the year. Seven families moved more than once, and one family moved four times in twelve months. The latter was a family of four, a couple, the husband's sixty-seven-year-old mother, and a fourteen-year-old son. From December to April, they lived in a two-room rented house, for which they paid $2 a month. In April, they moved to a two-room house owned by a relative. For this they paid no rent. In May, they moved to another relative's house; and, in June, to still another. In September, they moved once more, this time to a two-room house for which they paid $1.57 a month. The family was helped by relatives, as the man had lost his position with the *Kuo Min Chün,* the People's Army, and was able to get work for only three months. His income for the year was $49.30; his expenditure $354.70. Fortunately the family had some savings from which they could meet most of their budget.

If these figures are typical, Peiping families do an unusual amount of moving from one house to another. Almost one out of every five families, 19.5 per cent, a large proportion, moved during the year. Americans are noted for being a restless people, but they apparently move less often than this group of Peiping families. According to the records of the American Telephone and Telegraph

7: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AF12 North China AF12

Company, one out of every eight American families moves during the year. 361

The poorer families, having little furniture and other household equipment, can move without much trouble, and one might expect that the difficulties of making regular rent payments, et cetera, would force them to move more often than well-to-do families, but they were only average in this respect. The largest proportion of families who moved was found among those with the larger incomes. Twenty per cent of the families with incomes of less than $50 a month moved during the year; 26 per cent of those with incomes of over $100 a month; and only 14 per cent of those receiving between $50 and $100 a month

Of the larger income families, three moved during the year from rented quarters to houses which they owned—one, because the head of the house had trouble with his step-mother; another, because the man had received a fellowship, and his family went to live with his parents while he was abroad; and the third, because the man left an employer who had been giving him his house as part of his salary.

If the study had been made in 1929, we would undoubtedly have found a much larger proportion of families who changed their living quarters during the year. After the capital was moved to Nanking in 1928, a great many people left the city, and Peiping suffered severe economic depression. Rents came down, but it is reported that many of the landlords refused to reduce the rents for their old tenants. Naturally this meant that a great many families moved in order to reduce their rent, and moved several times as rents continued to decrease. While some houses were leased for long terms, and one 361 427

family was paying about one-third the current rent value on account of a long lease on the property, most of the cheaper houses were rented by the month and could be given up at any time.

Rents were still going up in 1927, for the accounts of 20 families showed that their rent was raised. Thirteen of these families were renting only one room. Ten were paying less than $1 a month rent. For eight of those ten, the increase was 10 cents a month. The largest increase was $2 a month. The rent for three rooms, occupied by a family in the $25 income group, was raised from $4 to $6; and the rent of four rooms, occupied by a family in the $40 group, was raised from $6 to $8. Other increases ranged from 48 cents to $1.50. The largest proportional increase was from 48 cents to $1, or 108 per cent.

Some landlords require tenants to pay more than one month's rent when they take possession of a house. Personal experience gave us the impression that ordinarily it was three months' rent. This would be regarded as payment for two months, the first and last of the rent contract, plus a tip amounting to a month's rent, for the landlord's servants who were supposed to prepare the property for the new occupant. The accounts show, however, that the requirement of advance rent was far from universal. Only 11 of the 55 families that moved from one house to another reported the payment of any advance rent, or tip. The first month these families were in their new houses, they paid from 1.3 to 2.5 months' rent. None of them paid as much as three months' rent. Only six of the 11 paid an amount equal to two or more months' rent. These were evidently paying the last month's rent in ad-

7: Gamble S-5 (1926-1927) 1933 AF12 North China AF12

vance. Although it is not shown in the accounts, it seems fairly safe to assume that the landlord gave the fractional amounts to his servants as one of their perquisites, and to pay for any work they had done in preparing the house for the new tenant.

When asking a Chinese family how large their house is, one does not ask them how many rooms they have, but how many *chien*. A *chien* is ordinarily the space between two roof trusses. It is not an absolute unit, but varies in size from seven by eight, to nine by twelve feet. The average is probably about eight by eight, or eight by nine, feet. A large room would count as several *chien* and a small one sometimes as only one-half a *chien*, but for our families the number of *chien* and the number of rooms was probably so nearly the same that we have used the terms interchangeably.

One hundred and twenty-four families, 44 per cent, were living in one room; 53 in two rooms; and 34 in three rooms.

Only three of the 30 families with incomes of less than $15 a month had more than one room, and none had more than two. Of the 116 families with incomes of less than $25 a month, only three had more than two rooms. No family had four rooms until the income was more than $35 a month, and no family had five rooms until the income was over $60 a month. One family in the $50 group was living in one room; and it was not until the income was more than $60 a month that all the families had at least two rooms; and not until the income was more than $100 a month that they all had four rooms. Six families had houses with ten or more *chien*. One of these was in the $60 group. The others all had incomes

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

511 262 Food expenses include cereals, vegetables, condiments, meats and refreshments. These expenses were obtained first by ascertaining the quantity of each kind of food consumed every month and then multiplying it by its average monthly price. There are six kinds of cereals in common use: white wheat flour, black wheat flour, corn flour, rice, millet, and green beans. For the poor families, black wheat flour and corn flour are the principal cereals, while only workers earning more than $20 a month can afford to eat rice. Appetizers of the poor families consist simply of salted vegetables and shrimp sauce. Meat is seldom taken by the worker's families, except during festivals and new year holidays.

511 427 Rent is the amount paid for occupying the house. Where an occupant is the owner of the house, rent is estimated by valuation. Rent is very low in comparison with all other expenses. Three explanations may be offered for this phenomenon. First, some of these houses were bought by the factory and rented to the workers at an especially low rental. Secondly, in spite of the steady rise of prices in recent years, an old occupant of a house usually enjoyed the privilege of paying rent at the original rate and was not effected by its rise. Besides, some workers lived in the west of Tangku, where rent was usually half of what one should pay for a room in the sections near to the town. Thirdly, the size of these families is small, the average size being only 3.72 persons per family. Thus, a one-room-house would be sufficient to accommodate them all. Even those who had bigger families would prefer to stay in a small house and enjoy less comfort in order to reduce their expenses.

[342] 362 511 427 The worker's houses are generally built of mud with frail framework. Sometimes rooms are built around a courtyard accommodating from five to twenty families. Glass windows and brick floor are but rarely found in such rooms. Except those who lived in their own houses, each of these working familes only occupied one or two rooms. It is shown in Table 36 that the average number of rooms of the 61 families was 1.72 per family, the average number of persons per room was 2.67 persons or 2.05

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

Table 36.—Average Number of Persons Per Room and Average Amounts of Rent in One Year by Income Groups.

Income group	Number of families	Average number of persons living in home per family		Average number of rooms per family	Average number of persons per room		Average rent in one year		
		persons	equivalent adult males		persons	equivalent adult males	Per families	Per persons	Per equi. adult males
$130 and under $180	22	3.27	2.37	1.18	2.77	2.00	$ 11.72	$ 3.58	$ 4.93
$180 and under $230	21	3.09	2.31	1.17	2.65	1.98	12.95	4.18	5.60
$230 and under $280	10	3.80	2.77	1.60	2.37	1.73	18.74	4.93	6.76
$280 and under $330	4	5.00	3.58	1.87[1]	2.66	1.90	29.00	5.80	8.11
$330 and under $380	2	6.50	4.20	2.25[1]	2.88	1.86	33.75	5.19	8.03
$380 and under $430	1	6.00	5.10	2.00	3.00	2.55	30.00	5.00	5.88
$430 and under $480	1	6.00	4.40	2.00	3.00	2.20	24.00	4.00	5.45
All incomes	61	4.80	3.51	1.72	2.67	2.03	22.88	4.67	6.39

[1] One family of this group occupied 3 rooms.

362
C11
427

8: Lin E-5 (1927)1928 AF12 North China AF12

362 equivalent adult males, and the average amount of rent was $22.88
511 a year per family or $4.67 a year per capita. Very few families
427 could afford to live in two-roomed houses. The common way is to rent a one-and-half room house which consists of a kitchenet and a bed room. Sometimes two families may share a three-roomed house with 1½ rooms for each. Thus it is possible to do cooking in one room and sleep in the other. But it is also found that certain families live in one room where a kitchen stove is connected with the *kang*. This is not only uncomfortable but also far from being hygienic, since food is prepared in the bedroom.

511 The clothes the worker and his people wear are generally
291 made of cloth. Imported satin is hardly used except in very few families with high income. Some poor families were found to buy flour bags from the factory and make them into garments.

511 Expenses for fuel and light include those for coal, reeds (a
372 plant used for fuel in North China) oil, and water. Some families picked their own reeds and coal for fuel. The value of fuel for such families was estimated and included both in family income and in the fuel expenses.

511 Miscellaneous expenses are exceptionally high, as they include both ordinary expenses for sanitation, social intercourse, tea and tobacco, furniture, toilet articles, new year entertainments, religion and amusements, and occasional expenses for transportation, education, medicine, marriage and funeral service. Extra charge for marriage and funeral accounted, in most cases, for the swelling of the expenditure figures in the miscellaneous group. For instance, the marriage and funeral expenses of the family in the sixth income group alone amounted to $120 which is much higher than the miscellaneous expenses of any other group.

In Table 38, the income, total expenses and food expenses per family together with the total and food expenses per adult male are classified according to equivalent adult male groups. It may be noted from the Table that income, total expenses and food expenses per family increase with the number of equivalent adult males in family of each group, but food expenses per equi-